4: Gayton E-5 (1925-1930)1946
NS29 Yokuts NS29

shaman, was exhibited time and again. Of this I am sure: that the sense of intimacy between a person and "his" actual animals in the environment was deep and real. Thus, for example: "Rattlesnake is my poša; if he'd bitten any other horse it would have killed him sure—but it didn't kill *mine*";[24] "Eagle was mad at me; that's why my baby was sick" (excessive milk curds diagnosed as Eagles faeces in an infant's mouth). This association, between an individual and an animal, routed through the religious or social system, is the personalized aspect of the more general human-animal equation appearing in broader terms in the culture (as exemplified in the earlier anecdote).

In a culture with both material and intangible concern for features of its natural surroundings it seems difficult to dismiss environment as "of rather minor importance in personality formation."[25] Even though, "between the natural environment and the individual there is always interposed a human environment [culture] which is vastly more significant,"[26] the role of external environment in the human environment (culture) can be of major importance and therefore, through the cultural mechanism, be of deep psychological significance. It is possible that a basic element of the mental state known as nostalgia, or the state of intense uneasiness in strange surroundings, is the year by year, life long conditioning of an individual to a specific topographic configuration, flora, and fauna.[27] The subtle interplay of locale or geographic form and personal psychology have been disclosed in a recent study of Yurok childhood orientation.[28]

The intense immediacy of native environment in all its aspects is a condition not too easily realized by the academic field investigator from our own denaturalized civilization, especially when the people under study already have lost their aboriginal setting—as have most of our North American Indians. The natural condition might be succinctly stated as; the less culture, the more environment. The anthropologist is hyper-conscious of the cultural mechanism as the selective or distorting lens through which the native views his environment. But for the native the lens does not exist; he deals directly with the externals which impinge upon him. Environments are seen and modulated in terms of the reacting cul-

24 The ill-logic (in our thinking) that a "benevolent" rattlesnake should have bitten the man's horse *at all*, is completely submerged in the prideful satisfaction that the horse did not die, was merely temporarily ill and recovered.

25 Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Background of Personality* (New York, 1945), p. 11.

26 *Loc. cit.*

27 Cf. Morris Edward Opler, *Dirty Boy: a Jicarilla Tale of Raid and War* (Memoirs, American Anthropological Association, no. 52, 1938), pp. 12, 33.

28 Erik Homburger Erikson, *Observations on the Yurok: Childhood and World Image* (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, vol. 35, no. 10, 1943).